

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/009,909	02/20/2002	Christoph Schwemler	Mo6846/LeA 33,663	Mo6846/LeA 33,663 8764	
157 75	590 01/25/2005		EXAMINER		
BAYER MATERIAL SCIENCE LLC			PHASGE, ARUN S		
PITTSBURGH			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•	•		1753		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				31/ /
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/009,909	SCHWEMLER ET AL	
(Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Arun S. Phasge	1753	
Th Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication ap ply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addre	ss
THE MAIL - Extensions after SIX (6 - If the period - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If or reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep d for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period eply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute acceived by the Office later than three months after the mailing ent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
Status				
1)⊠ Res	ponsive to communication(s) filed on 02 A	lovember 2004.		•
· <u> </u>	·	s action is non-final.		
	ce this application is in condition for allowa ed in accordance with the practice under i	•		erits is
Disposition o	of Claims			
4a) 0 5)	m(s) <u>1 and 3-9</u> is/are pending in the applic Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra m(s) is/are allowed. m(s) <u>1,3-9</u> is/are rejected. m(s) is/are objected to. m(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Application F	apers			
9) The	specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) <u></u> The	drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ acc	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	Examiner.	
Appl	icant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
	acement drawing sheet(s) including the correc oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•		, ,
Priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)	owledgment is made of a claim for foreign b)	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Sta	ge
Attachment(s)		_		
	eferences Cited (PTO-892) raftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
3) 🔲 Information	Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08))/Mail Date			2)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigeniwa of record in view of Bennett of record for reasons of record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/2/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that there is no motivating reason to combine the references.

The examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. In re Nomiya, 184 U.S.P.Q. 607. However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Simon, 174 U.S.P.Q. 114; In re McLaughlin, 170

U.S.P.Q. 209. References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. In re Bozek, 163 U.S.P.Q. 545.

All that is required to show obviousness is that the applicant "make his claimed invention merely by applying knowledge clearly present in the prior art. Section 103 requires us to presume full knowledge by the inventor of the prior art in the field of his endeavor." In re Winslow, 151 U.S.P.Q. 48 CCPA (1966).

The motivation was disclosed in the prior action.

The primary reference failed to disclose the amount of sodium chloride in the water and the subsequent use of the water in an electrolysis cell. The secondary reference was cited to show the use of a sodium chloride water that was treated as the primary reference and with the subsequent use of the water in an electrolysis cell.

Applicants further argue that the cited art fails to disclose where the water came from, i.e., the production of polycarbonate. It makes little or no patentable weight where the waste water comes from, since applicants are claiming the treatment of water and not where the water comes from. Further, applicants are claiming the electrolysis process and not where the contaminated brine is coming from.

Accordingly, the claims are rejected.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun S. Phasge whose telephone number is (571) 272-1345. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 1753

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197-(toll-free).

Arun S. Phasge

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1753